

REMARKS

Formal Matters

Claims 7-12 are pending in the application. Claims 8-12 are amended herein to make explicit how the business process generating sequence and the process flow are defined. Accordingly, the claims are amended to recite that the business process generating sequence and the business process flow are defined by “user accommodation”, that is, user inputs. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification on page 11, line 26 to page 12, line 8. No new matter has been added.

This amendment is filed with a Request for Continued Examination.

Summary of Telephone Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview of September 25, 2006. In the interview, the Examiner indicated that the phrase “a business process *defining* a generation sequence” and the step of “*defining* a process flow comprising a relationship among a plurality of said business procedures” seem to distinguish the invention from prior art supply and demand processing systems. The Examiner suggested that the claims be amended to recite more details regarding how the business process generating sequence and the process flow are defined. No specific claim language was discussed.

Rejection of Claims 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 7-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as anticipated by Wilson et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0133387 (“Wilson”). This rejection should be withdrawn based on the comments and remarks herein.

Wilson discloses a supply chain management system which facilitates the efficient allocation and shipment of items (abstract). A client can submit a plurality of requests in batch form, to request multiple items for shipment concurrently (page 4, paragraph 0034). A client may choose to submit a request for promise, and then submit a request for order, or may submit only the request for order (page 6, paragraph 0046). Both the request for promise and the request for order are of the same general format and contain the same data except the request for order may contain an identifier to match the request for order with a previously provided promise (page 5, paragraph 0037). The client interacts with its customer to determine what the customer wants and then the client sends either a request for promise or a request for order to a promising engine (page 1, paragraph 0008). Thus, regardless of the customer or client input, only two outcomes, or business flows, are available: request for promise and request for order.

In contrast, independent claims 7 and 9-11 of the present application recite a business process based on execution and completion of the demand information and supply information. Further, claims 8, 9, and 12 recite a business flow defined by user accommodation and claims 10 and 11 recite defining a process flow defined by user accommodation and comprising a relationship among a plurality of said business procedures. Wilson does not disclose or suggest that a business flow can be defined by the user; he merely suggests that a pre-defined business flow can be selected by the user.

Further, because Wilson teaches only pre-defined business flow, Wilson also does not disclose or suggest a business procedure defining a generation sequence of a plurality of sets of information as recited in claims 8-12. Similarly, Wilson does not disclose or suggest a business flow master which registers the business flow defining a relationship

among a plurality of sets of said business procedures as also recited in claims 8, 9, and 12.

It has been held by the courts that "Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the claim." *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist and Derrick Company et al.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481 (Fed. Cir. 1984). For at least the foregoing reasons, the claimed invention is not anticipated by the cited reference. Accordingly, claims 7-12 are each patentably distinguishable the prior art. Therefore, applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Katherine R. Vieyra
Registration No. 47,155

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

KRV/kd